

<b>Meeting Title:</b>	MTAC PTR eVS Work Group 178		
<b>Meeting Objective(s):</b>	Monthly meeting with Industry		
<b>Date:</b>	5/20/2016	<b>Time:</b>	12:00-1:00 PM ET
<b>Location:</b>	WebEx/Juliaann's Conference Room		
<b>Attendees:</b>	Alvin Serrano, Bert Hamilton, Bob Schimek, Brian Bowers, Bryan Buri, Christiana Halim, D Kennedy, DeWitt Crawford, Henry Chau, Jaclyn Tubbin, , Joe Mallozzi, John Medeiros, John Papp, Juliaann Hess, Lina Kelly, Marsha, Oscar Vazquez, Randy Randall, Richard Porras, Steve Belmonte, Vicki Bosch, Vicki Damsel, Willie Jackson, Maura Lowell, Paige Eckard		

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Minutes</b>
1.	Timeline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>USPS is proposing to move the end date of the Work Group to June 15<sup>th</sup> to provide more time to come to consensus.</li> <li>USPS also suggested meeting twice a week, but Industry thought this would be difficult. It was proposed to extend the meetings on Wednesdays instead.</li> <li>Industry is concerned about the July 31<sup>st</sup> date to implement the quality validation assessments.</li> <li>The August 1<sup>st</sup> date to begin assessments is a suggestion by USPS but is up for discussion.</li> <li>Per John Medeiros, Industry did not agree to the timeline. Industry is not ready to accept the July 31<sup>st</sup> implementation date. However, at the first Work Group meeting Industry did agree to the notional timeline.</li> <li>Richard Porras suggests USPS wait until after Holiday Peak season to begin assessment on the 10 validations. He also noted that a suggestion from PostCom was to decrease the number of validations. He has yet to agree on anything yet.</li> <li>Per Bob Schimek, USPS could remove the August 1<sup>st</sup> date and continue discussions with Industry. D. Kennedy agrees that USPS can implement on July 31<sup>st</sup> but to push the assessments back. Industry would like to begin getting data on July 31<sup>st</sup> as long as it is not assessed yet.</li> <li>Industry is asking for a runway to understand the metrics prior to assessment.</li> <li>Industry is proposing that USPS start measurement but not assessment on July 31<sup>st</sup>. USPS is already measuring the validations and sending data to customers. The information can be found in the BMEUs.</li> <li>Steve Belmonte proposed that USPS send out actual assessments to customers but note not to pay to allow a grace period and provide reality of the measurements. This will allow Industry to understand the impact of not providing quality address, barcode and manifests.</li> <li>As Industry originally agreed to the notional timeline and approach, they are not at the point where decisions are being made too quickly and the group is overlooking these. For example Industry is seeing demonstrations moving too fast by overlooking the thresholds for 2016.</li> </ul>

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The exact match is difficult for a User Group as an Industry that has never been set before by other customers using address matching software. 5 years ago, Industry only needs a 5 digit ZIP Code and now USPS is requesting new information from Mailers.</li> <li>The target of Work Group 178, as stated in the Charter, was to complete by the end of May.</li> <li>The Work Group agreed that the meetings will be extended an extra half hour on Wednesdays.</li> <li>The group may not agree 100% on all objectives as there are still 1-2 quality validations not in consensus.</li> </ul>
2.	Industry feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Per Bryan Buri, a non-eVS customer, his company has been following quality assessments closely. He is finding that there are areas where they are out of compliance. The whole Industry has been looking closer at the metrics over the past few months. Industry is researching how to correct the non-compliant issues but the process is moving too fast for them to ensure they comply.</li> <li>John Medeiros pointed out that USPS still has duplicate assessment (the incorrect ZIP Code for entry facility) with eVS in the proposed validations.</li> <li><b>ACTION:</b> USPS to include John's feedback of duplicate assessment of the incorrect ZIP Code in the entry facility.</li> <li><b>ACTION:</b> Industry to continue to provide feedback to USPS.</li> </ul>
3.	eVS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The eVS pilot is all or nothing. The thresholds are currently set to 0%. Industry confirmed that is the case because they cannot see any information on PostalOne!</li> <li><b>ACTION:</b> USPS to look into a way to reveal the charged without an assessment and without impacting the 3 IMpb metrics already in place.</li> <li>The eVS calculations still include the 69 quality elements. The data flows from PTR to eVS so customer files still include all the fields. Once the Work Group comes to an agreement on which elements will be assessed, those will be measured going forward.</li> <li>Industry still does not know which elements in the dataset are being assessed yet.</li> <li>Per Steve Belmonte, USPS should move forward with putting in a grace period to customers prior to assessment.</li> </ul>
4.	Objective: Discussion Calculations, How Compliance Measured through Payment Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>USPS has measured timeliness for the Shipping Service File as a result of Work Group 166.</li> <li>USPS has heard feedback of compiling the core compliance validations and the quality compliance validations.</li> <li>Package will not be counted for duplicate assessments.</li> <li>PTR measures compliance at Midnight at the Arrival at Post Office file that USPS sees. The file is sent to eVS daily at 6 AM.</li> </ul>
5.	Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>ACTION:</b> USPS to begin with eVS slides next week.</li> <li><b>ACTION:</b> USPS to look at performance trends for only the 10 items USPS is proposing.</li> <li>Per John Medeiros, the data Industry is seeing in eVS for IMpb is different from that in the reports. Industry identified duplicate assessment in the destination</li> </ul>

Agenda Item	Topic	Minutes
		entry validation for incorrect ZIP Codes for entry facility.

**Action Items:**

Action Item	Description	Action Item Owner
1.	Include John Medeiros' feedback of USPS duplicate assessments in eVS and IMpb quality for the incorrect ZIP Code in the entry facility (Entry Facilitation Mismatch)	USPS
2.	Continue to provide feedback to USPS.	Industry
3.	Look into a way to reveal IMpb Quality Non-Compliance fees without charging the assessment and without impacting the three IMpb assessed categories already in place.	USPS
4.	Provide performance trends for only the proposed validations.	USPS